## TOWN OF BROOKLYN NOTICE OF PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

Regular Meeting to Consider the Agenda Below Wednesday, April 6, 2005 7:00 PM
Town Office —First National Bank Building,
Intersection of Highways 23, 49 and A, Green Lake, WI
www.tn.brooklyn.wi.gov.

## NOTICE OF TOWN BOARD MEETING

Members of the Town of Brooklyn Board may attend the Town of Brooklyn Plan Commission meeting at the above-specified time and place. Members would attend for the purpose of gathering information regarding the following agenda. The Town Board at this meeting will take no votes or other action.

## **Minutes**

- Call meeting to order by Ron Benson at 7:00 p.m.
- Present: Ron Benson- Plan Commission Chairman, Plan Commissioners: Carolyn King, Roger Priebe, Mary Jane Bumby, Phyllis Peterson, Tom Esslinger; Joann LaMire; Amy Every (Omnni); Mike Wuest, Town Chairman; Marian Mildebrandt (Recording Secretary), Susan McConnell (Town Board Supervisor) arrived 7:15 p.m.
- Pledge of Allegiance said by all present
- Approve Agenda: M/S Mary Jane Bumby/Roger Priebe,
- Approve minutes of last Plan Commission Meeting: Question was asked about what Attorney wanted to have address: Amy indicated that she had addressed them to Attorney Wertsch and he did not have any problem with it M/S Tom Esslinger/Mary Jane Bumby, Motion carried.
- Structure of the meeting. If anyone has a problem or suggestion, please hold questions. Until done and then we will address them.
- Old Business
  - Discussion surrounding the new County Land Division Ordinance.
  - Ron asked Phyllis about changes in the old Subdivision Ordinance

     starting on page 23. In the Omni version, condimum development
     the county has the condimums in their ordinance.
     Phyllis could not find in the county ordinance.
     Phyllis felt this was important for the group.
     MJB It is in the county under zoning.
     Amy will look into it and let us know.
     If we want to be stronger, otherwise we do not add to our ordinance.

Page 29 in old book to 30.it's left out of the Omni. Street design and layout. Look in the county page 31 on Subdivision.

Page 32 Site planning – Town standards – Page 29 in Omni under Street grade #8, it does what certain standards are. There are 6 items under street grading in the old one and she could not find in the new one.

Page 34 is left out. Street trees. – there is nothing in Omni. Is to be deleted from old plan. It is covered in county

Page 33 – old one / under 7.7 in the Omni page 34 under other utilities, easements shall adhere to the county ordinance. – on page 31 is subdivisions and easements for all utilities are underground. Orlo Bierman– utility companies like to put things underground. Ron move that we add the underground utilities where fesible to the plan. Ron asked Amy to word the statement. They also want the utility to decide which way to go if there is a problem with the way it is hooked up.

Same pages – 6.8 of the old to 34 of Omni. Stormwater facilities. It was listed that the town engineer review. Omni said the overall subdivision ordinance has the town engineer reviewing.

Mary Jane was concerned that there is not a lot limit size. If over 1 acre, you need a stormwater plan. This is county and state plan.

Ron feels that we do not have to address road standards, he feels that we leave them at the town standards. – including site grading.

Page 35 old – Omni agrees with county. It is not in county. We could refer to another section in the county zoning, for utility easement. It usually runs between two lots down the middle. Phyllis thinks 6.15 should be included (of the old).

Page 30 – 42 old plan. We had alternatives 1 and 2. deal with 7.2 on pg. 39 was deleted. And 7.1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 was all deleted. (Joann LaMire). These were not included in the copy from the Attorney.

If there is a pond or wetland, there would be 300 feet boundary to protect it. – not in Omni.\

Amy will cover 7 points and get answers.

Amy started her presentation.

1. Ordinance – first change is page 17 Section 3.11 – which includes a power point presentation. Everyone received a copy of the power point. Primary conservation areas cannot be developed. Secondary conservation areas can be developed. Potential development areas, not the whole site. Yield plant – asks how many lots can be in the area. She then discussed 3.11 Conservation design subdivision – example. Section C does not have to be included if we agree in section b. Ron – feeling that if it isn't causing a problem, don't mess with it. Amy - a conservation plan is beneficial because is it may be cheaper for the developer, and the people like the views on a conservation plan. Some town's require it in a town ordinance.

Ron – is the county % strict enough. \_ Discussion – . When the plan commission broke away from the county, it was to make the town more open spaces. Q. would we make it all conservation plan. Amy – 30 % low - 45-50% is normal. The fact that it is an option makes it weaker. Some go as high as 95%. Orlo Bierman – doesn't think it is fair to require all subdivision to be conservation. He doesn't believe that there will be much development in the town. Phyliss Peterson. Is the 30% for the county strong enough. Ron Benson. Feels that if we do not use the conservation subdivisions, it doesn't make any difference what the % is. Susan McConnell – she doesn't feel that the town can demand it. She feels that this township is trying to set higher level. She thinks that the town level should have it an option. Orlo Bierman. All developers read the subdivision ordinance, before they start. Joann LaMire: we are here to serve the people of the community not the developers. Table to another meeting and have it publicized and let people come and talk about it. They want to keep it rural and this would keep it rural. P. Peterson: she feels that we should use the models that Amy has provided. – 2<sup>nd</sup> question – do we make the conservation subdivisions. Should indicate at this time that we "prefer" that they do conservation subdivisions.

Page 25,,, Page 26 Page 27 6.8 (b) page 29 pp outlots are removed. To eliminate ownership later on. Page 3 0. page 31 page 33 page 35 – flag lots and removal of outlots. Cul-de-sac – 80 feet , Amy – most of her town's are 66 ft across. Table until next time. Amy look at state standards.and fire standards. – research.

Pg. 45. Amy – Sharon Gehbhardt wanted to know (last meeting) what the definition of Right-of-Way. She struck it out.

Appendix C - House site location -

Fees – she had a handout regarding fee schedules with several examples.

Susan McConnell– wants a meeting – for the conservator plan and a campground.

Amy Emry— one change that she has not made is the pyramid lots— Mary Jane Bumby - recreational — zoning. #19 — access site/lot. She feels that it is restrict enough. Orlo Bierman — it is already in place no changes have to be made.

Amy Emry– time needs 5 working days to make the changes that were discussed tonight..

Ron Benson— wants any requests in writing or a phone call. To either Ron Benson or the Clerk — Marian Mildebrandt. Suggestion by Tom Esslinger, that the town board should approve a form for people to fill out if they want

to make an appearance before the Plan Commission and that be posted on the website.

Next meeting – April 27, 2005 at 7:00 p.m.

Adjournment 9:25 p.m.by Tom Esslinger/ seconded by Phyllis Peterson